

On the existence of vertex-disjoint subgraphs with high degree sum*

Shuya Chiba^{1†‡} Nicolas Lichiardopol^{2§}

¹*Department of Mathematics and Engineering, Kumamoto University,
2-39-1 Kurokami, Kumamoto 860-8555, Japan*

²*Lycée Craponne, Salon, France*

June 24, 2016

Abstract

For a graph G , we denote by $\sigma_2(G)$ the minimum degree sum of two non-adjacent vertices if G is non-complete; otherwise, $\sigma_2(G) = +\infty$. In this paper, we prove the following two results; (i) If $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ are integers and if G is a non-complete graph with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$, then G contains two vertex-disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 such that each H_i is a graph of order at least $s_i + 1$ with $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$. (ii) If $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ are integers and if G is a triangle-free graph of order at least 3 with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$, then G contains two vertex-disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 such that each H_i is a graph of order at least $2s_i$ with $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$. By using this result, we also give some corollaries concerning the degree conditions for the existence of k vertex-disjoint cycles.

Keywords: Vertex-disjoint; Subgraphs; Decompositions; Minimum degree sum

AMS Subject Classification: 05C70; 05C38

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider finite simple graphs, which have neither loops nor multiple edges. For terminology and notation not defined in this paper, we refer the readers to [4]. Let G be a graph. We denote by $V(G)$, $E(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ the vertex set, the edge set and the minimum degree of G , respectively. We write $|G|$ for the order of G , that is, $|G| = |V(G)|$. We denote by $d_G(v)$ the degree of a vertex v in G . The invariant $\sigma_2(G)$ is defined to be the minimum degree sum of two non-adjacent vertices of G , i.e., $\sigma_2(G) = \min \{d_G(u) + d_G(v) : u, v \in V(G), u \neq v, uv \notin E(G)\}$ if G is non-complete; otherwise, let $\sigma_2(G) = +\infty$. We denote by $g(G)$ the *girth* of G , i.e., the length of a shortest cycle of G . In this paper, “disjoint” always means “vertex-disjoint”. A pair (H_1, H_2) is called a *partition* of G if H_1 and H_2 are two disjoint induced subgraphs of G such that $V(G) = V(H_1) \cup V(H_2)$.

Stiebitz [14] considered the decomposition of graphs under degree constraints and proved the following result.

*An extended abstract has been accepted in: EuroComb 2015, Electr. Notes Discrete Math., vol. 49, 2015, pp. 359–366.

[†]This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant 26800083

[‡]E-mail address: schiba@kumamoto-u.ac.jp

[§]E-mail address: nicolas.lichtardopol@neuf.fr

Theorem A (Stiebitz [14]) *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$ be integers, and G be a graph. If $\delta(G) \geq s_1 + s_2 + 1$, then there exists a partition (H_1, H_2) of G such that $\delta(H_i) \geq s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Kaneko [11] showed that this result holds for triangle-free graphs with minimum degree at least $s_1 + s_2$. (Diwan further improved Theorem A for graphs with girth at least 5, see [6]. Bazgan, Tuza and Vanderpooten [1] gave polynomial-time algorithms that find such partitions.)

Theorem B (Kaneko [11]) *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$ be integers, and G be a graph. If $\delta(G) \geq s_1 + s_2$ and $g(G) \geq 4$, then there exists a partition (H_1, H_2) of G such that $\delta(H_i) \geq s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

The purpose of this paper is to consider σ_2 -versions of Theorems A and B. More precisely, we consider the following problems.

Problem 1 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a non-complete graph. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$, then there exists a partition (H_1, H_2) of G such that $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$ and $|H_i| \geq s_i + 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Problem 2 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a graph of order at least 3. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$ and $g(G) \geq 4$, then there exists a partition (H_1, H_2) of G such that $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$ and $|H_i| \geq 2s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

In Problem 1 (resp., Problem 2), if we drop the condition “ $|H_i| \geq s_i + 1$ (resp., $|H_i| \geq 2s_i$)” in the conclusion, then it is an easy problem. Because, for each edge xy in a graph G satisfying the assumption of Problem 1 (resp., the assumption of Problem 2), $H_1 = G[\{x, y\}]$ and $H_2 = G - \{x, y\}$ satisfy $\sigma_2(H_1) = \infty > 2s_1 - 1$ and $\sigma_2(H_2) \geq \sigma_2(G) - 2|\{x, y\}| \geq 2s_2 - 1$. Here, for a vertex subset X of a graph G , $G[X]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by X , and let $G - X = G[V(G) \setminus X]$. (Similarly, for the case where $s_i = 1$ for some i , we can easily solve it.)

In addition, if G_2 is a complete bipartite graph $K_{s_1+s_2-1, s_1+s_2}$, then $\sigma_2(G_2) = 2(s_1 + s_2) - 2$ and G_2 does not contain partitions as in Problem 2. Thus, G_2 shows that the condition “ $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$ ” in Problem 2 is best possible if it’s true. Moreover, if G_1 is a balanced complete multipartite graph with $r + 1$ (≥ 4) partite sets of size s (≥ 2), then $\sigma_2(G_1) = 2rs = 2((rs - r + 1) + (r - 1) + 1) - 2$, and we can check that G_1 contains no partitions as in Problem 1 for $(s_1, s_2) = (rs - r + 1, r - 1)$. Thus, the condition “ $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$ ” in Problem 1 is also best possible in a sense if it’s true.

Before giving the main result, we introduce the outline of the proof of Theorems A and B. The proof consists of the following two steps:

Step 1: To show the existence of two disjoint subgraphs of high minimum degree, i.e., we show the existence of two disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 such that $\delta(H_i) \geq s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Step 2: To show the existence of two disjoint subgraphs of high minimum degree that partition $V(G)$ by using Step 1.

In particular, in the proof of Theorems A and B, Step 2 is easily solved. In fact, if G is a graph with $\delta(G) \geq s_1 + s_2 - 1$, and if G contains a pair (H_1, H_2) of disjoint subgraphs with $\delta(H_i) \geq s_i$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then we can easily transform the pair into the partition of G keeping its minimum degree condition (see [14, Proposition 4]).

Considering the situation for the proof of Theorems A and B, one may approach Problems 1 and 2 by following the same steps as above. However, for the case of σ_2 -versions, Step 2 as well as Step 1 are not an easy problem because we allow vertices with low degree. In fact, in the proof of Step 2 for Theorem A ([14, Proposition 4]), the assumption that every vertex has high degree plays a crucial role. At the moment, we don't know whether we can extend disjoint subgraphs of high minimum "degree sum" to a partition or not. However, we can solve Step 1 for Problems 1 and 2. The following are our main results.

Theorem 1 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a non-complete graph. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$, then there exist two disjoint induced subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G such that $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$ and $|H_i| \geq s_i + 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Theorem 2 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a graph of order at least 3. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$ and $g(G) \geq 4$, then there exist two disjoint induced subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G such that $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$ and $|H_i| \geq 2s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Note that the above graphs G_1 and G_2 also show that σ_2 conditions in Theorems 1 and 2 are best possible, respectively.

In order to show Theorems 1 and 2, we actually prove slightly stronger results as follows. Here, for a graph G and an integer s , we define $V_{\leq s}(G) = \{v \in V(G) : d_G(v) \leq s\}$.

Theorem 3 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a non-complete graph. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$, then there exist two disjoint induced subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G such that for each i with $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the following hold:*

- (i) $d_{H_i}(u) \geq s_i$ for $u \in V(H_i) \setminus V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$.
- (ii) $d_{H_i}(u) + d_{H_i}(v) \geq 2s_i - 1$ for $u \in V(H_i) \setminus V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$ and $v \in V(H_i) \cap V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$ with $uv \notin E(H_i)$.
- (iii) $|H_i| \geq s_i + 1$.

Theorem 4 *Let $s_1, s_2 \geq 2$ be integers, and G be a graph of order at least 3. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$ and $g(G) \geq 4$, then there exist two disjoint induced subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G such that for each i with $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the following hold:*

- (i) $d_{H_i}(u) \geq s_i$ for $u \in V(H_i) \setminus V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$.
- (ii) $d_{H_i}(u) + d_{H_i}(v) \geq 2s_i - 1$ for $u \in V(H_i) \setminus V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$ and $v \in V(H_i) \cap V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$ with $uv \notin E(H_i)$.
- (iii) $|H_i| \geq 2s_i$.

Note that if G is a graph with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$, then $G[V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)]$ is a complete graph (see Lemma 1(i) in Subsection 2.1). Therefore, for any two distinct non-adjacent vertices

in such a graph G , at least one of the two vertices belongs to $V(G) \setminus V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$, i.e., (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3 imply that $\sigma_2(H_i) \geq 2s_i - 1$. Thus Theorem 1 immediately follows from Theorem 3. Moreover, since $V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\delta(G) \geq s_1 + s_2 + 1$ for a graph G , Theorem 3 also implies Step 1 for Theorem A. Similarly, Theorem 4 implies Theorem 2 and Step 1 for Theorem B. In the next section, we give some concepts and lemmas to prove Theorems 3 and 4. We will prove Theorems 3 and 4 in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

This kind of results are sometimes useful tools to get degree conditions for *packing* of graphs, i.e., the existence of k disjoint subgraphs which belong to some fixed class of graphs. In the last section (Section 5), we will explain it by taking disjoint cycles for example, and give some corollaries about it.

We mention similar results. In 1966, Lovász [13] proved a dual type of Theorem A with respect to maximum degree; Every graph with maximum degree at most $s_1 + s_2 + 1$ has a partition (H_1, H_2) such that the maximum degree of each H_i is at most s_i . On the other hand, Thomassen [16, 17] conjectured the connectivity version of Theorem A; Every $(s_1 + s_2 + 1)$ -connected graph has a partition (H_1, H_2) such that each H_i is s_i -connected, and he showed that this conjecture is true for $s_2 \leq 2$ (see [15]). However, this conjecture is still wide open for other cases, and hence there is a huge gap between “degree” and “connectivity”. Other similar concepts can be found in [7, 8, 12, 19]. Therefore, this type problem has been extensively studied.

2 Preparations for the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4

2.1 Terminology and notation

We first prepare terminology and notation which we use in the rest of this paper, and we also give some lemmas in this subsection (Lemmas 1 and 2).

Let G be a graph. For disjoint subsets X_1 and X_2 of $V(G)$, we define $e_G(X_1, X_2)$ to be the number of edges of G between X_1 and X_2 . We often identify a subgraph H of G with its vertex set $V(H)$. For example, we write $G - H$ instead of $G - V(H)$, and we write $e_G(H_1, H_2)$ instead of $e_G(V(H_1), V(H_2))$ for disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G . A *clique* of G is a (possibly empty) vertex subset of G that induces a complete subgraph of G , and we denote by $\omega(G)$ the cardinality of the largest clique of G .

By the definition of $\sigma_2(G)$, we can obtain the following. Since the proof is easy, we omit it.

Lemma 1 *Let $s \geq 1$ be an integer, and G be a graph with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2s - 1$. Then,*

- (i) $V_{\leq s-1}(G)$ is a clique (and hence, if $g(G) \geq 4$, then $|V_{\leq s-1}(G)| \leq 2$).
- (ii) If G is non-complete, then $|G| \geq s + 2$.
- (iii) If G is non-complete and $g(G) \geq 4$, then $|G| \geq 2s$.

For a partition (G_1, G_2) of a graph G and integers $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$, we define

$$f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) = |E(G_1)| + |E(G_2)| + s_2|G_1| + s_1|G_2|.$$

Then, by the definition of the function f , we can obtain the following. (In order to find disjoint subgraphs as in Theorems 3 and 4, we will consider some partition which was chosen so that the value f is maximized, see Sections 3 and 4 for more details.)

Lemma 2 *Let s_1, s_2, i be integers with $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and let (G_1, G_2) be a partition of a graph G . If u_i is a vertex in G_i such that $e_G(u_i, G_{3-i}) - d_{G_i}(u_i) \geq (s_{3-i} - s_i) + k$ for some integer k , then $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) \geq f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) + k$, where $G'_i = G_i - u_i$ and $G'_{3-i} = G[V(G_{3-i}) \cup \{u_i\}]$.*

Proof. By the symmetry, it is enough to consider the proof for only the case $i = 1$. By the definitions of f, G'_1 and G'_2 , we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) &= |E(G'_1)| + |E(G'_2)| + s_2|G'_1| + s_1|G'_2| \\ &= (|E(G_1)| - d_{G_1}(u_1)) + (|E(G_2)| + e_G(u_1, G_2)) + s_2(|G_1| - 1) + s_1(|G_2| + 1) \\ &= f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) + (e_G(u_1, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u_1)) - (s_2 - s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $e_G(u_1, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u_1) \geq (s_2 - s_1) + k$, then the assertion clearly holds. $\square$

2.2 Feasible graphs and degenerate graphs

In this subsection, we generalize the concepts of feasible graphs and degenerate graphs which were used in Stiebitz' argument [14], and we will give some remarks and lemmas about it.

Now, let G be a graph, and let X be a clique of G . For an integer $s \geq 1$, an induced subgraph H of G is said to be $(s; X)$ -feasible in G , if H satisfies the following conditions (F1)–(F3):

- (F1) $d_H(u) > s$ for $u \in V(H) \setminus X$.
- (F2) $d_H(u) + d_H(v) > 2s$ for $u \in V(H) \setminus X$ and $v \in V(H) \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(H)$.
- (F3) H is non-complete.

(Note that the conditions (F1) and (F2) imply $\sigma_2(H) > 2s$ because X is a clique.)

For an integer $s \geq 1$, an induced subgraph G' of G is said to be $(s; X)$ -degenerate in G if G' satisfies the following conditions (D1) and (D2):

(D1) Any non-complete induced subgraph H of G' is not $(s; X)$ -feasible in G , i.e., one of the following holds:

- $d_H(u) \leq s$ for some $u \in V(H) \setminus X$, or
- $d_H(u) + d_H(v) \leq 2s$ for some $u \in V(H) \setminus X$ and $v \in V(H) \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(H)$.

(D2) G' is non-complete.

For integers $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$, a partition (G_1, G_2) of G is called an $(s_1, s_2; X)$ -degenerate partition of G if each G_i is $(s_i; X)$ -degenerate.

Remark 1 Let $s \geq 1$ be an integer, and let G be a graph and X be a clique of G . Then, an induced subgraph G' of G is non-complete and not $(s; X)$ -degenerate if and only if G' contains an $(s; X)$ -feasible graph in G .

Lemma 3 Let $s \geq 2$ be an integer, and G be a graph and X be a clique of G . Suppose that $\omega(G) \leq s$. Then, the following hold.

- (i) If H is an $(s; X)$ -feasible graph in G , then $H - x$ is an $(s - 1; X)$ -feasible graph in G for every vertex x of H .
- (ii) If G' is an $(s - 1; X)$ -degenerate graph in G , then $G[V(G') \cup \{x\}]$ is an $(s; X)$ -degenerate graph in G for every vertex x of $G - G'$.

Proof. (i) Let $x \in V(H)$, and let $H' = H - x$. Then by (F1), $d_{H'}(u) > s - |\{x\}| = s - 1$ for $u \in V(H') \setminus X$. Similarly, by (F2), we also have $d_{H'}(u) + d_{H'}(v) > 2s - 2|\{x\}| = 2(s - 1)$ for $u \in V(H') \setminus X$ and $v \in V(H') \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(H')$. Furthermore, by (F1)–(F3) and Lemma 1(ii), $|H| \geq s + 2$, and hence $|H'| \geq s + 1$. This, together with $\omega(G) \leq s$, implies that H' is non-complete. Thus (i) is proved.

(ii) To show (ii), let $x \in V(G - G')$, and let $G'' = G[V(G') \cup \{x\}]$. Note that by (D2), G'' is also non-complete. Suppose that G'' is not $(s; X)$ -degenerate. Then by Remark 1, G'' contains an $(s; X)$ -feasible graph H of G . If $V(H) \subseteq V(G')$, then this contradicts that G' is $(s - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Thus $x \in V(H)$. But then, by Lemma 3(i), $H - x$ is an $(s - 1; X)$ -feasible graph contained in G' , a contradiction again. Thus (ii) is proved. $\square$

Lemma 4 Let s_1, s_2, ε be integers with $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. Let G be a graph with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + \varepsilon) - 1$, $X = V_{\leq s_1 + s_2 + \varepsilon - 1}(G)$, and (G_1, G_2) be a partition of G . If G_i is $(s_i - 1 + \varepsilon; X)$ -degenerate for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then there exist two vertices u_i and v_i of G_i satisfying one of the following (a) and (b).

- (a) $e_G(u_i, G_{3-i}) - d_{G_i}(u_i) \geq (s_{3-i} - s_i) + 1$, $d_{G_i}(u_i) \leq s_i - 1 + \varepsilon$ and $u_i = v_i$, or
- (b) $e_G(u_i, G_{3-i}) - d_{G_i}(u_i) \geq (s_{3-i} - s_i) + 1$, $d_{G_i}(v_i) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$ and $v_i \in V(G_i) \cap X$.

Proof. By the symmetry, it is enough to consider the proof for only the case $i = 1$.

Suppose that G_1 is $(s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon; X)$ -degenerate. Assume for the moment that there exists a vertex u in $V(G_1) \setminus X$ such that $d_{G_1}(u) \leq s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon$. Then, since $u \notin X$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(u, G_2) &= d_G(u) - d_{G_1}(u) \geq (s_1 + s_2 + \varepsilon) - (s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon) \\ &= s_2 + 1 = s_2 - 1 + \varepsilon + 1 + (1 - \varepsilon) \geq s_2 - 1 + \varepsilon + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $e_G(u, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u) \geq (s_2 - s_1) + 1$, and hence (a) holds as $(u_1, v_1) = (u, u)$. Thus, we may assume that $d_{G_1}(u) \geq s_1 + \varepsilon$ for all $u \in V(G_1) \setminus X$.

Then, since G_1 is $(s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon; X)$ -degenerate, it follows that there exist two vertices $u \in V(G_1) \setminus X$ and $v \in V(G_1) \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(G_1)$ such that $d_{G_1}(u) + d_{G_1}(v) \leq 2(s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon)$.

Since $d_{G_1}(u) \geq s_1 + \varepsilon$, we have $d_{G_1}(v) \leq s_1 - 2 + \varepsilon$, that is, $d_{G_1}(v) = s_1 - l + \varepsilon$ for some integer $l \geq 2$. If $e_G(v, G_2) \geq s_2 - l + \varepsilon + 1$, then (a) holds as $(u_1, v_1) = (v, v)$, and thus we may assume that $e_G(v, G_2) \leq s_2 - l + \varepsilon$. Then,

$$d_G(v) = d_{G_1}(v) + e_G(v, G_2) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2l + 2\varepsilon \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2.$$

Note that $d_{G_1}(u) \leq s_1 - 2 + l + \varepsilon$ because $d_{G_1}(u) + d_{G_1}(v) \leq 2(s_1 - 1 + \varepsilon)$ and $d_{G_1}(v) = s_1 - l + \varepsilon$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(u, G_2) &\geq \sigma_2(G) - d_{G_1}(u) - d_G(v) \\ &\geq (2(s_1 + s_2 + \varepsilon) - 1) - (s_1 - 2 + l + \varepsilon) - (s_1 + s_2 - 2l + 2\varepsilon) \\ &= s_2 + l + 1 - \varepsilon = (s_2 - 2 + l + \varepsilon) + 3 - 2\varepsilon \geq (s_2 - 2 + l + \varepsilon) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $e_G(u, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u) \geq (s_2 - s_1) + 1$. Thus, (b) holds as $(u_1, v_1) = (u, v)$. $\square$

2.3 Lemmas for Theorem 3

In this subsection, we prepare lemmas which will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Lemma 5 *Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 3, and $X = V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$ and $U \subsetneq V(G)$ with $|U| = s_{3-i} + \alpha$ for some integers $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\alpha \leq 1$. Under the same degree condition as in Theorem 3, the following hold; (i) $d_{G-U}(u) > s_i - \alpha$ for $u \in V(G - U) \setminus X$, (ii) $d_{G-U}(u) + d_{G-U}(v) > 2(s_i - \alpha)$ for $u \in V(G - U) \setminus X$ and $v \in V(G - U) \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(G - U)$, and (iii) $|G - U| \geq (s_i - \alpha) + 3$.*

Proof. It is enough to consider the proof for only the case $i = 1$. By the degree condition of G , the definition of X and the assumption that $|U| = s_2 + \alpha$, we can easily check that (i) and (ii) hold. Moreover, since G is non-complete, it follows from Lemma 1(ii) that $|G| \geq s_1 + s_2 + 3$, and hence $|G - U| \geq (s_1 - \alpha) + 3$. Thus (iii) also holds. $\square$

Lemma 6 *Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 3 and $X = V_{\leq s_1+s_2}(G)$, and suppose that $\omega(G) \leq \min\{s_1, s_2\}$. Under the same degree condition as in Theorem 3, the following holds; If G' is $(s_i; X)$ -degenerate for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $G - G'$ is non-complete.*

Proof. By the symmetry, we consider the proof for only the case $i = 1$. Suppose that G' is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate and $G - G'$ is complete (note that G' is a proper subgraph of G , because G is not $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate). Since $|G - G'| \leq \omega(G) \leq \min\{s_1, s_2\}$, we have $|G - G'| = s_2 + \alpha$ for some integer $\alpha \leq 0$. Note that $(s_1 - \alpha) + 3 > \omega(G)$. By applying Lemma 5 with $U = V(G - G')$ and $i = 1$, it follows that $G' = G - U$ is an $(s_1 - \alpha)$ -feasible graph in G , which contradicts that G' is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. $\square$

2.4 Lemmas for Theorem 4

In this subsection, we prepare lemmas which will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.

Lemma 7 *Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 4 and $X = V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$, and let α be an integer with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$. Under the same conditions as in Theorem 4, the following holds; If U is a vertex subset of G such that $|U| \leq 3$ and $e_G(x, U) \leq 1 + \alpha$ for all $x \in V(G) \setminus U$, then $G - U$ is non-complete and not $(s_1 - \alpha; X)$ -degenerate, and not $(s_2 - \alpha; X)$ -degenerate.*

Proof. By the degree condition of G and the definition of X , $d_{G-U}(u) \geq d_G(u) - e_G(u, U) \geq (s_1 + s_2) - (1 + \alpha) = (s_1 - \alpha) + s_2 - 1 > s_1 - \alpha$ for $u \in V(G - U) \setminus X$. Similarly, $d_{G-U}(u) + d_{G-U}(v) \geq \sigma_2(G) - e_G(\{u, v\}, U) \geq (2(s_1 + s_2) - 1) - 2(1 + \alpha) = 2(s_1 - \alpha) + 2s_2 - 3 > 2(s_1 - \alpha)$ for $u \in V(G - U) \setminus X$ and $v \in V(G - U) \cap X$ with $uv \notin E(G - U)$. By Lemma 1(iii), $|G| \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) > 6$, and hence $|G - U| \geq 3$. Since $g(G) \geq 4$, this implies that $G - U$ is non-complete. Thus, $G - U$ is $(s_1 - \alpha; X)$ -feasible in G . By the symmetry of s_1 and s_2 , $G - U$ is also $(s_2 - \alpha; X)$ -feasible in G . Therefore, it follows from Remark 1 that the lemma holds. $\square$

Lemma 8 *Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 4 and $X = V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$. Under the same conditions as in Theorem 4, the following holds; If G' is $(s_i; X)$ -degenerate for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $G - G'$ is non-complete.*

Proof. By the symmetry, it suffices to consider the proof for only the case $i = 1$.

Suppose that G' is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate and $G - G'$ is complete (note that G' is a proper subgraph of G , because G itself is not $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate). Then by Lemma 1(i), $|G - G'| \leq 2$. Since $g(G) \geq 4$, this implies that $e_G(x, G - G') \leq 1$ for all $x \in V(G') = V(G) \setminus V(G - G')$. Therefore, by applying Lemma 7 with $U = V(G - G')$ and $\alpha = 0$, it follows that $G' = G - U$ is not $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 9 *Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 4 and $X = V_{\leq s_1+s_2-1}(G)$, and let (G_1, G_2) be a pair which is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition or an $(s_1 - 1, s_2; X)$ -degenerate partition of G . Suppose that (G_1, G_2) was chosen so that $f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$ is maximized in such partitions. Under the same conditions as in Theorem 4, the following holds; If G_i is $(s_i - 1; X)$ -degenerate for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then G_{3-i} is not $(s_{3-i} - 1; X)$ -degenerate.*

Proof. By the symmetry of s_1 and s_2 , we only show that if G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, then G_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate.

Suppose that G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate (note that by the assumption of Lemma 9, G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate). By applying Lemma 4 with $\varepsilon = 0$ and $i = 2$, we can take a vertex u_2 of G_2 such that $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 1$. Then, by Lemma 2, $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) > f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$, where $G'_1 = G[V(G_1) \cup \{u_2\}]$ and $G'_2 = G_2 - u_2$.

Assume first that G'_2 is non-complete. Then, since G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, G'_2 is clearly $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Hence by the choice of (G_1, G_2) , G'_1 is not $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. Note that

G'_1 is non-complete because G_1 is non-complete, and hence by Remark 1, G'_1 contains an $(s_1; X)$ -feasible graph H of G . If $u_2 \notin V(H)$, then H is an induced subgraph of G_1 , which contradicts that G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. Thus $u_2 \in V(H)$. Note that $\omega(G) \leq 2 \leq s_1$ because $g(G) \geq 4$. Then, by Lemma 3(i), $H - u_2$ is an induced subgraph of G_1 which is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -feasible in G . Thus, by Remark 1, G_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate.

Assume next that G'_2 is complete. Then by Lemma 1(i), $|G'_2| \leq 2$, and hence we have $|G_2| \leq 3$. Then, since $g(G) \geq 4$, it follows that $e_G(x, G_2) \leq 2$ for all $x \in V(G_1)$. Therefore, by applying Lemma 7 with $U = V(G_2)$ and $\alpha = 1$, it follows that $G_1 = G - U$ is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Thus, we can obtain the desired conclusion. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 3

Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 3, and suppose that $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + 1) - 1$. We first show the following claim.

Claim 3.1 *We may assume that $\omega(G) \leq \min\{s_1, s_2\}$.*

Proof. Suppose not, and let H_1 be the complete subgraph of order exactly $\min\{s_1, s_2\} + 1$, and let $H_2 = G - H_1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\min\{s_1, s_2\} = s_1$. Then by applying Lemma 5 as $(U, i, \alpha) = (V(H_1), 2, 1)$, we can easily see that H_1 and H_2 are desired subgraphs. $\square$

Now let $X = V_{\leq s_1 + s_2}(G)$, and we will find a partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) of G such that

$$\text{each } G_i^* \text{ is non-complete and is not } (s_i - 1; X)\text{-degenerate}$$

(if such a partition exists, then by Lemma 1(ii) and Remark 1, our result follows).

Claim 3.2 *We may assume that G contains an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition.*

Proof. Take an induced subgraph G_1 which is non-complete and not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate (we can actually take such a subgraph because G itself is one of such subgraphs). Choose G_1 so that $|G_1|$ is as small as possible. We first claim that G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. Suppose not. Then, since G_1 is non-complete, G_1 contains an $(s_1; X)$ -feasible graph H of G . Let $x \in V(H)$, and let $G'_1 = H - x$. Then by Lemma 3(i) and Claim 3.1, G'_1 is an $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -feasible graph of order less than G_1 , i.e., G'_1 is non-complete and not an $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate graph such that $|G'_1| < |G_1|$ from Remark 1, which contradicts the choice of G_1 . Thus G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate.

Note that by Lemma 6 and Claim 3.1, $G_2 := G - G_1$ is non-complete. Therefore, if G_2 is not $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, then (G_1, G_2) is the desired partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) . Thus, we may assume that G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. $\square$

Let (G_1, G_2) be a pair which is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition or an $(s_1 - 1, s_2; X)$ -degenerate partition of G (we can take such a partition by Claim 3.2). Choose such a partition

so that $f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$ is as large as possible (see the definition of f in Subsection 2.1). By the symmetry, we may assume that (G_1, G_2) is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition of G . We now apply Lemma 4 with $\varepsilon = 1$ and $i = 1$. Then, we can take a vertex u_1 of G_1 such that $e_G(u_1, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u_1) \geq (s_2 - s_1) + 1$, and hence by Lemma 2, $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) > f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$, where $G'_1 = G_1 - u_1$ and $G'_2 = G[V(G_2) \cup \{u_1\}]$.

Suppose first that G'_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Note that by Lemma 6 and Claim 3.1, $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ is non-complete, and then G'_1 is clearly $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate because G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. Thus, (G'_1, G'_2) is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition such that $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) > f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$, which contradicts the choice of (G_1, G_2) .

Suppose next that G'_2 is not $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Since $G'_2 = G[V(G_2) \cup \{u_1\}]$ and G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, it follows from Lemma 3(ii) and Claim 3.1 that G'_2 is $(s_2; X)$ -degenerate. Then, the choice of (G_1, G_2) yields that G'_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Moreover, since G'_2 is $(s_2; X)$ -degenerate, it follows from Lemma 6 and Claim 3.1 that $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ is non-complete. On the other hand, since G_2 is non-complete, we also see that G'_2 is non-complete, i.e., G'_2 is non-complete and not $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Therefore, (G'_1, G'_2) is the desired partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) .

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 4

Let s_1, s_2, G be the same as in Theorem 4, and suppose that $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) - 1$ and $g(G) \geq 4$. We first show the following claim.

Claim 4.1 *If v_1 and v_2 are distinct vertices of $V_{\leq s_1 + s_2 - 1}(G)$, then we may assume that $d_G(v_1) = s_1 + s_2 - 1$ or $d_G(v_2) = s_1 + s_2 - 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist two distinct vertices v_1 and v_2 of $X := V_{\leq s_1 + s_2 - 1}(G)$ such that $d_G(v_i) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Note that by Lemma 1(i), X is a clique and $X = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Since $g(G) \geq 4$, we have $e_G(u, X) \leq 1$ for all $u \in V(G) \setminus X$. Let u be an arbitrary vertex of $G - X$, and let v_i be a vertex of X with $uv_i \notin E(G)$. Then,

$$d_{G-X}(u) \geq \sigma_2(G) - d_G(v_i) - e_G(u, X) \geq (2(s_1 + s_2) - 1) - (s_1 + s_2 - 2) - 1 = s_1 + s_2.$$

Since u is an arbitrary vertex of $G - X$, this implies that $\delta(G - X) \geq s_1 + s_2$. Hence, by Theorem B, there exists a partition (H_1, H_2) of $G - X$ such that $\delta(H_i) \geq s_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By Lemma 1(iii), H_1 and H_2 are the desired subgraphs. $\square$

Now let $X = V_{\leq s_1 + s_2 - 1}(G)$, and we will find a partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) of G such that

$$\text{each } G_i^* \text{ is non-complete and is not } (s_i - 1; X)\text{-degenerate}$$

(if such a partition exists, then by Lemma 1(iii) and Remark 1, our result follows).

Claim 4.2 *We may assume that G contains an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition.*

Proof. Note that $\omega(G) \leq 2 \leq \min\{s_1, s_2\}$ and hence, replacing “Lemma 6” with “Lemma 8” in the proof of Claim 3.2, the same argument as Claim 3.2 can work. Thus, we can obtain the desired conclusion. $\square$

Let (G_1, G_2) be a pair which is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition or an $(s_1 - 1, s_2; X)$ -degenerate partition of G (we can take such a partition by Claim 4.2). Choose (G_1, G_2) so that

(C1) $f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2)$ is as large as possible.

By the symmetry, we may assume that (G_1, G_2) is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition. Then, by Lemma 9 and (C1), G_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. We further choose such a partition (G_1, G_2) so that

(C2) $|G_1|$ is as small as possible, subject to (C1).

Then by (C1) and (C2), we can obtain the following.

Claim 4.3 *If x is a vertex of G_1 , then we may assume that $e_G(x, G_2) - d_{G_1}(x) \leq s_2 - s_1$. In particular, if the equality holds, then $G_1 - x$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate.*

Proof. Let $x \in V(G_1)$, and suppose that $e_G(x, G_2) - d_{G_1}(x) = s_2 - s_1 + k$ for some integer $k \geq 0$. Then by Lemma 2, $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) \geq f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) + k$, where $G'_1 = G_1 - x$ and $G'_2 = G[V(G_2) \cup \{x\}]$.

Suppose first that G'_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Note that by Lemma 8, $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ is non-complete, and then G'_1 is clearly $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate because G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate. Thus, (G'_1, G'_2) is an $(s_1, s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate partition such that $f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) \geq f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) + k$ and $|G'_1| < |G_1|$, which contradicts (C1) or (C2). Thus G'_2 is not $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate.

Since $\omega(G) \leq 2 \leq s_2$ and G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, it follows from Lemma 3(ii) that G'_2 is $(s_2; X)$ -degenerate. Therefore, if $k \geq 1$, then (C1) yields that G'_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, and hence (G'_1, G'_2) is the desired partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) (note that by Lemma 8, $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ is non-complete, and note also that G'_2 is non-complete because G_2 is non-complete). On the other hand, if G'_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, even if $k = 0$, then (G'_1, G'_2) is the desired partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) . $\square$

We now define

$$Z_1 = \{z \in V(G_1) \setminus X : d_{G_1}(z) = s_1 \text{ and } e_G(z, G_2) = s_2\}.$$

Claim 4.4 *We have $Z_1 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. On the contrary, suppose that $Z_1 = \emptyset$.

Subclaim 4.4.1 *$d_{G_1}(u) > s_1$ for $u \in V(G_1) \setminus X$.*

Proof. If there exists a vertex u of $V(G_1) \setminus X$ such that $d_{G_1}(u) \leq s_1$, then by Claim 4.3 and the definition of X , it is easy to check that $d_{G_1}(u) = s_1$ and $e_G(u, G_2) = s_2$, and hence $u \in Z_1$, a contradiction. $\square$

Since G_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate, it follows from Subclaim 4.4.1 that there exist two vertices $u_1 \in V(G_1) \setminus X$ and $v_1 \in V(G_1) \cap X$ with $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G_1)$ such that $d_{G_1}(u_1) + d_{G_1}(v_1) \leq 2s_1$. Since $d_{G_1}(u_1) > s_1$ by Subclaim 4.4.1, we have $d_{G_1}(v_1) = s_1 - l$ for some integer $l \geq 1$.

Subclaim 4.4.2 $d_G(v_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2l - 1$ ($\leq s_1 + s_2 - 3$).

Proof. By Claim 4.3, $e_G(v_1, G_2) \leq s_2 - l$. Suppose that $e_G(v_1, G_2) = s_2 - l$. Then $e_G(v_1, G_2) - d_{G_1}(v_1) = (s_2 - l) - (s_1 - l) = s_2 - s_1$. Hence by Claim 4.3, $G_1 - v_1$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Note that by Subclaim 4.4.1, $d_{G_1 - v_1}(u) > s_1 - 1$ for $u \in V(G_1 - v_1) \setminus X$. Therefore, there exist two vertices $u'_1 \in V(G_1 - v_1) \setminus X$ and $v'_1 \in V(G_1 - v_1) \cap X$ with $u'_1 v'_1 \notin E(G_1 - v_1)$ such that $d_{G_1 - v_1}(u'_1) + d_{G_1 - v_1}(v'_1) \leq 2(s_1 - 1)$. Since $d_{G_1 - v_1}(u'_1) > s_1 - 1$, this implies that $d_{G_1 - v_1}(v'_1) \leq s_1 - 2$, and hence $d_{G_1}(v'_1) \leq s_1 - 1$. Combining this with Claim 4.3, we also get $e_G(v'_1, G_2) \leq s_2 - 1$. Therefore, v_1 and v'_1 are two distinct vertices of X such that $d_G(v_1) = d_{G_1}(v_1) + e_G(v_1, G_2) \leq (s_1 - l) + (s_2 - l) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$ and $d_G(v'_1) = d_{G_1}(v'_1) + e_G(v'_1, G_2) \leq (s_1 - 1) + (s_2 - 1) = s_1 + s_2 - 2$, which contradicts Claim 4.1. Thus $e_G(v_1, G_2) \leq s_2 - l - 1$, and hence $d_G(v_1) = d_{G_1}(v_1) + e_G(v_1, G_2) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2l - 1$ ($\leq s_1 + s_2 - 3$). $\square$

By Subclaim 4.4.2, $d_G(u_1) \geq \sigma_2(G) - d_G(v_1) \geq (2(s_1 + s_2) - 1) - (s_1 + s_2 - 2l - 1) = s_1 + s_2 + 2l$. On the other hand, since $d_{G_1}(u_1) + d_{G_1}(v_1) \leq 2s_1$ and $d_{G_1}(v_1) = s_1 - l$, it follows that $d_{G_1}(u_1) \leq s_1 + l$. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(u_1, G_2) - d_{G_1}(u_1) &= (d_G(u_1) - d_{G_1}(u_1)) - d_{G_1}(u_1) \\ &\geq (s_1 + s_2 + 2l - (s_1 + l)) - (s_1 + l) = s_2 - s_1. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 4.3, the equality holds in the above. In particular, $d_{G_1}(u_1) = s_1 + l$. Moreover, again by Claim 4.3, $G_1 - u_1$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate.

We now choose such vertices u_1 and v_1 so that $d_{G_1}(u_1) + d_{G_1}(v_1)$ is as small as possible. Since $G_1 - u_1$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, there exist two vertices $u'_1 \in V(G_1 - u_1) \setminus X$ and $v'_1 \in V(G_1 - u_1) \cap X$ with $u'_1 v'_1 \notin E(G_1 - u_1)$ such that $d_{G_1 - u_1}(u'_1) + d_{G_1 - u_1}(v'_1) \leq 2(s_1 - 1)$ (recall that by Subclaim 4.4.1, $d_{G_1 - u_1}(u) > s_1 - 1$ for $u \in V(G_1 - u_1) \setminus X$). Then by the choice of u_1 and v_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2s_1 &= (s_1 + l) + (s_1 - l) = d_{G_1}(u_1) + d_{G_1}(v_1) \leq d_{G_1}(u'_1) + d_{G_1}(v'_1) \\ &= d_{G_1 - u_1}(u'_1) + d_{G_1 - u_1}(v'_1) + |E(G) \cap \{u_1 u'_1, u_1 v'_1\}| \leq 2(s_1 - 1) + 2 = 2s_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the equality holds in the above. The equality $|E(G) \cap \{u_1 u'_1, u_1 v'_1\}| = 2$ implies that $v_1 \neq v'_1$ because $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G)$. Since $d_{G_1}(u_1) + d_{G_1}(v_1) = d_{G_1}(u'_1) + d_{G_1}(v'_1)$, we can replace u_1 and v_1 with u'_1 and v'_1 , respectively. Therefore, Subclaim 4.4.2 also holds for the vertex v'_1 , and hence v_1 and v'_1 are two distinct vertices of X such that $d_G(v_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 3$ and $d_G(v'_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 3$, which contradicts Claim 4.1.

This completes the proof of Claim 4.4. $\square$

Claim 4.5 *Suppose that there exists a vertex u_2 of G_2 such that $zu_2 \in E(G)$ for all $z \in Z_1$.*

- (i) *There exists a vertex v_1 of $V(G_1) \cap X$ such that $d_G(v_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$.*
- (ii) *If $d_{G_2}(u_2) \leq s_2 - 1$, then $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 3$.*

Proof. (i) Let $z \in Z_1$. Then by the definition of Z_1 and Claim 4.3, $G_1 - z$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Suppose first that there exists a vertex u_1 of $V(G_1 - z) \setminus X$ such that $d_{G_1 - z}(u_1) \leq s_1 - 1$. Then, $d_{G_1}(u_1) = d_{G_1 - z}(u_1) + |E(G) \cap \{u_1 z\}| \leq (s_1 - 1) + 1 = s_1$. Combining this with Claim 4.3, we also get $e_G(u_1, G_2) \leq s_2$, and hence $d_G(u_1) = d_{G_1}(u_1) + e_G(u_1, G_2) \leq s_1 + s_2$. On the other hand, it follows from the definition of X that $d_G(u_1) \geq s_1 + s_2$. Therefore, the inequality holds in the above. The equalities $d_{G_1}(u_1) = s_1$ and $e_G(u_1, G_2) = s_2$ imply that $u_1 \in Z_1$. The equality $|E(G) \cap \{u_1 z\}| = 1$ implies that $u_1 z \in E(G)$. But then, from the assumption of Claim 4.5, $G[\{u_2, z, u_1\}]$ forms a triangle, a contradiction. Thus $d_{G_1 - z}(u) > s_1 - 1$ for $u \in V(G_1 - z) \setminus X$.

Since $G_1 - z$ is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, this implies that there exist two vertices $u_1 \in V(G_1 - z) \setminus X$ and $v_1 \in V(G_1 - z) \cap X$ with $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G_1 - z)$ such that $d_{G_1 - z}(u_1) + d_{G_1 - z}(v_1) \leq 2(s_1 - 1)$. Since $d_{G_1 - z}(u_1) > s_1 - 1$, we have $d_{G_1 - z}(v_1) \leq s_1 - 2$, and hence $d_{G_1}(v_1) \leq s_1 - 1$. Combining this with Claim 4.3, we also get $e_G(v_1, G_2) \leq s_2 - 1$, and hence $d_G(v_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$. Thus (i) is proved.

(ii) It suffices to show that $e_G(u_2, G_1) \geq s_1 + 2$. To show it, let $z \in Z_1$ and v_1 be a vertex of $V(G_1) \cap X$ such that $d_{G_1}(v_1) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$ (we can take such a vertex v_1 by (i)). By the degree condition of G , $zv_1 \in E(G)$. Recall that by the assumption of Claim 4.5, $zu_2 \in E(G)$, and hence $u_2 v_1 \notin E(G)$ because $g(G) \geq 4$. Therefore, if $e_G(u_2, G_1) \leq s_1 + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2(G) &\leq d_G(v_1) + d_G(u_2) = d_G(v_1) + (d_{G_2}(u_2) + e_G(u_2, G_1)) \\ &\leq (s_1 + s_2 - 2) + ((s_2 - 1) + (s_1 + 1)) = 2(s_1 + s_2) - 2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus $e_G(u_2, G_1) \geq s_1 + 2$. $\square$

Claim 4.6 *There exist two vertices $z_1 \in Z_1$ and $u_2 \in V(G_2)$ satisfying one of the following (A) and (B).*

- (A) $z_1 u_2 \notin E(G)$ and $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 1$, or
- (B) $z_1 u_2 \in E(G)$ and $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 3$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 4 with $\varepsilon = 0$ and $i = 2$. Then, there exist two vertices u_2 and v_2 of G_2 satisfying one of the following (a) and (b):

- (a) $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 1$, $d_{G_2}(u_2) \leq s_2 - 1$ and $u_2 = v_2$, or
- (b) $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 1$, $d_G(v_2) \leq s_1 + s_2 - 2$ and $v_2 \in V(G_2) \cap X$.

We further take $z_1 \in Z_1$, and choose it so that $z_1 u_2 \notin E(G)$ if possible. If $z_1 u_2 \notin E(G)$, then (a) and (b) directly imply (A). Thus we may assume that $z_1 u_2 \in E(G)$. Then by the choice of z_1 , $z u_2 \in E(G)$ for all $z \in Z_1$. It follows from Claims 4.1 and 4.5(i) that (b) does not occur. Thus, (a) holds. By Claim 4.5(ii), the inequality $d_{G_2}(u_2) \leq s_2 - 1$ implies that $e_G(u_2, G_1) - d_{G_2}(u_2) \geq (s_1 - s_2) + 3$. Thus (B) holds. $\square$

Let z_1 and u_2 be the same as in Claim 4.6. Consider the graphs

$$\begin{aligned} G'_1 &= G_1 - z_1, & G'_2 &= G[V(G_2) \cup \{z_1\}], \\ G''_1 &= G[V(G'_1) \cup \{u_2\}], & G''_2 &= G'_2 - u_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (G'_1, G'_2) and (G''_1, G''_2) are partitions of G , respectively. Then by Lemma 2, Claim 4.6 and the definitions of Z_1, G'_1, G'_2, G''_1 and G''_2 , we get

$$f(G''_1, G''_2, s_1, s_2) \geq f(G'_1, G'_2, s_1, s_2) + 1 = f(G_1, G_2, s_1, s_2) + 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Claim 4.7 *Each G''_i is $(s_i; X)$ -degenerate.*

Proof. By Claim 4.3 and the definitions of Z_1 and G'_1 , it follows that G'_1 is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, and hence by Lemma 3(ii) and the definition of G''_1 , we see that G''_1 is $(s_1; X)$ -degenerate (recall that $\omega(G) \leq 2 \leq s_1$). Combining this with Lemma 8, we also see that $G''_2 = G - G'_1$ is non-complete. Since G_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, it follows from Lemma 3(ii) and the definition of G'_2 that G'_2 is $(s_2; X)$ -degenerate. Hence, $G''_2 = G'_2 - u_2$ is clearly $(s_2; X)$ -degenerate because G''_2 is non-complete. $\square$

By Claim 4.7 and (4.1), if G''_1 is $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, or if G''_2 is $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate, then this contradicts (C1). Thus, G''_1 is not $(s_1 - 1; X)$ -degenerate and G''_2 is not $(s_2 - 1; X)$ -degenerate. Since each G''_i is non-complete by Claim 4.7, it follows that (G''_1, G''_2) is the desired partition (G_1^*, G_2^*) .

This completes the proof of Theorem 4. $\square$

5 Applications

5.1 Degree conditions for vertex-disjoint cycles

In Sections 1–4, we have considered the existence of disjoint subgraphs with degree conditions, and we have shown Theorems 1 and 2, which correspond to Step 1 (the existence of two disjoint subgraphs of high minimum degree sum) for Problems 1 and 2. This type of results is sometimes useful tools to get degree conditions for packing of graphs, i.e., the existence of k disjoint subgraphs which belong to some fixed class of graphs. In this section, we explain it by taking disjoint cycles for example. In particular, we will give a sharp σ_2 condition for the existence of k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3 by using Theorem 2 (see statement (S2), Proposition 6 and Theorem 7).

In [2], Chen and Saito gave a minimum degree condition for the existence of a cycle of length 0-mod 3. Here, a cycle C is called a *cycle of length 0-mod 3* if $|C| \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.

Theorem C (Chen and Saito [2]) *Every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 3$ contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3.*

As a natural generalization of this result, we can consider the following problem.

Problem 3 *Is the following statement true for any $k \geq 1$?*

(S1) *Every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 3k$ contains k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3.*

In statement (S1), the minimum degree condition is best possible if it's true. Let k and n be integers with $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 6k - 2$, and consider the complete bipartite graph $K_{3k-1, n-3k+1}$. The minimum degree of this graph is clearly $3k - 1$, and every cycle of length 0-mod 3 in this graph has order at least 6, and hence it does not contain k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3. In addition, considering this example, we can also consider the more general problem as follows.

Problem 4 *Is the following statement true for any $k \geq 1$?*

(S2) *Every graph G of order at least $3k$ with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 6k - 1$ contains k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3.*

Since $\sigma_2(K_{3k-1, n-3k+1}) = 6k - 2$, the graph $K_{3k-1, n-3k+1}$ shows that “ $\sigma_2(G) \geq 6k - 1$ ” cannot be replaced by “ $\sigma_2(G) \geq 6k - 2$ ” in statement (S2). Moreover, since $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2\delta(G)$ for a graph G , it follows that statement (S2) is stronger than statement (S1) (note that $|G| \geq 3k$ in statement (S1)).

In order to attack the above problems, one may use the induction on k . In particular, for Problem 3, we already know that statement (S1) is true when $k = 1$ by Theorem C, that is, Problem 3 can be solved by showing the inductive step. In the inductive step of this type problem, Theorems A, B, 1 and 2 sometimes can work effectively. In fact, we can easily obtain the following by using Theorems B and 2, respectively.

Proposition 5 *If statement (S1) is true for $k = 1$, then statement (S1) is true for any $k \geq 1$.*

Proposition 6 *If statement (S2) is true for $k = 1$, then statement (S2) is true for any $k \geq 1$.*

We only show Proposition 6 because we can obtain Proposition 5 by the same argument.

Proof of Proposition 6. We show that statement (S2) is true for any $k \geq 1$ by induction on k . By the assumption of Proposition 6, statement (S2) is true when $k = 1$. Suppose that statement (S2) is true up to the row $k - 1$, $k \geq 2$, and let us study for k .

Let G be a graph of order at least $3k$ with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 6k - 1$. We show that G contains k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3. If G is complete, then the assertion clearly holds. Thus we may assume that G is non-complete.

Suppose first that G contains a triangle C . Then every vertex of G not in C has at most 3 neighbors in C , and hence $\sigma_2(G - C) \geq (6k - 1) - 6 = 6(k - 1) - 1$. Note that $|G - C| \geq 3(k - 1)$. Since statement (S2) is true for $k - 1$ by the induction hypothesis, $G - C$ contains $k - 1$ disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3. With the cycle C , we get then k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3.

Suppose now that $g(G) \geq 4$. Then, since $\sigma_2(G) \geq 6k - 1 = 2(3(k-1) + 3) - 1$, it follows from Theorem 2 that there exist two disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G such that $|H_1| \geq 2 \cdot 3(k-1) > 3(k-1)$, $\sigma_2(H_1) \geq 2 \cdot 3(k-1) - 1 = 6(k-1) - 1$, $|H_2| \geq 2 \cdot 3 > 3$ and $\sigma_2(H_2) \geq 2 \cdot 3 - 1 = 5$. Hence by the induction hypothesis, H_1 contains $k-1$ disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3, and H_2 contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3. We get then k disjoint cycles of lengths 0-mod 3 in G . $\square$

By Theorem C and Proposition 5, we see that Problem 3 is solved in affirmative. Similarly, by Proposition 6, it is only necessary to consider the case of $k = 1$ for Problem 4. In the next subsection, we completely solve Problem 4 by showing the following.

Theorem 7 *Every graph G of order at least 3 with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 5$ contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3.*

We mention other cases in the rest of this subsection. It is a well-known that every graph G of order at least $3k$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2k$ contains k disjoint cycles, which is a classical result by Corrádi and Hajnal [3]. By the similar argument of the proof of Proposition 6, we can easily obtain a slightly weaker version of this; Every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 3k - 1$ contains k disjoint cycles. Because if G is a graph with $\delta(G) \geq 3k - 1$, then Theorem A implies that G contains disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 such that $\delta(H_1) \geq 3(k-1) - 1$ and $\delta(H_2) \geq 2$ (see also [14, Corollary 2]). Similarly, Theorem B leads to a triangle-free version of Corrádi and Hajnal's (note that the minimum degree condition is best possible even if we assume a triangle-freeness). In addition, Enomoto [5] and Wang [18] independently gave a σ_2 -version as follows; Every graph G of order at least $3k$ with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 4k - 1$ contains k disjoint cycles. Theorems 1 and 2 immediately lead to slightly weaker versions of this result as above.

Recently, Gould, Horn and Magnant [9] proposed the following conjecture, which is a common generalization of the above Corrádi and Hajnal's theorem and Hajnal and Szemerédi's theorem [10] "every graph G of order exactly $(c+1)k$ and of minimum degree at least ck contains k disjoint complete graphs of orders $c+1$ ". Here, for an integer $c \geq 0$, a c -chorded cycle is a cycle with c chords.

Conjecture D (Gould, Horn and Magnant [9]) *Let c, k be integers with $c \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$. Every graph G of order at least $(c+1)k$ with $\delta(G) \geq ck$ contains k disjoint $\frac{(c+1)(c-2)}{2}$ -chorded cycles.*

They showed that this conjecture is true for very large graphs compared to c and k (see [9] for more details). However, by using Theorem A and the following result (Theorem E) by Gould et al. [9], we can easily obtain a slightly weaker version of Conjecture D (see Corollary 8).

Theorem E (Gould, Horn and Magnant [9]) *Let $c \geq 2$ be an integer. Every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq c$ contains a $\frac{(c+1)(c-2)}{2}$ -chorded cycle.*

Corollary 8 *Let c, k be integers with $c \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$. Every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq (c+1)k - 1$ contains k disjoint $\frac{(c+1)(c-2)}{2}$ -chorded cycles.*

In the same paper, they also showed that Conjecture D holds when G is triangle-free (see [9, Theorem 6]). However, we can also obtain it by using Theorems B and E. Moreover, if we can obtain a σ_2 -version of Theorem E, then by combining it with Theorem 1, we can also get the σ_2 -version of Corollary 8.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 7

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 7. In the proof, we will use the following Chen and Saito's result which is stronger than Theorem C.

Theorem F (Chen and Saito [2]) *Every graph G of order at least 3 with at most one vertex of degree less than 3, contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3.*

For a graph G of order n and an unordered pair $\{u, v\}$ of distinct vertices of G (adjacent or not), we define the graph $G_{u,v}$ of order $n - 1$, as follows:

- The vertices of $G_{u,v}$ are the vertices x of G distinct from u and v , and the pair $\{u, v\}$.
- The edges of $G_{u,v}$ are the edges xy of G with $x, y \notin \{u, v\}$ and the edges xy with $x = \{u, v\}$, $y \notin \{u, v\}$ and $e_G(y, \{u, v\}) \neq 0$.

For a graph G and an integer s , we further let $V_s(G) = \{v \in V(G) : d_G(v) = s\}$ and $V_{\geq s}(G) = \{v \in V(G) : d_G(v) \geq s\}$.

Proof of Theorem 7. We proceed by induction on $n := |G|$. Clearly the assertion is true for $n = 3$. Suppose that the assertion is true up to the row $n - 1$, $n \geq 4$, and let us study for n . So G is a graph of order $n \geq 4$ with $\sigma_2(G) \geq 5$. Clearly, if G contains triangles, we are done. So, we may suppose that $g(G) \geq 4$. Since $\sigma_2(G) \geq 5$ and $g(G) \geq 4$, it follows from Lemma 1(i) that $V_{\leq 2}(G)$ is a clique and $|V_{\leq 2}(G)| \leq 2$. If $|V_{\leq 2}(G)| \leq 1$, by Theorem F, G contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3. So, we may suppose that $|V_{\leq 2}(G)| = 2$, say $V_{\leq 2}(G) = \{x, y\}$. Recall that $xy \in E(G)$. Suppose that one of the vertices of $V_{\leq 2}(G)$, say y is of degree 1 in G . It is easy to see that the induced subgraph $G_1 = G - y$ of G has exactly one vertex of degree less than 3. Then G_1 contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3, and we are done. So $V_{\leq 2}(G) = \{x, y\} = V_2(G)$, and since x and y does not have a common neighbor (for otherwise triangles), x has a unique neighbor u distinct from y and y has a unique neighbor v distinct from x and u . Suppose first that $uv \in E(G)$. We put $G' = G - \{x, y\}$. It is easy to see that every vertex of $G'_{u,v}$ distinct from the vertex $\{u, v\}$ is of degree at least 3 in $G'_{u,v}$. Then $G'_{u,v}$ contains a cycle C of length 0-mod 3. If $\{u, v\}$ is not a vertex of C , clearly we are done. Suppose now that $\{u, v\}$ is a vertex of C . We put $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r, x_1)$, where $x_1 = \{u, v\}$. If u or v is a common neighbor of x_r and x_2 , clearly we are done. If it is not the case, we may suppose that x_2 is adjacent to v and that x_r is adjacent to u . Then $P = (v, x_2, \dots, x_r, u)$ is a path of G such that $|P| \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Since $x, y \notin V(P)$, $C' = (x, y, P, x)$ is a cycle of G of length 0-mod 3.

So, we may suppose that $uv \notin E(G)$. We distinguish two cases:

Case 1. $\{u, v\} \cap V_{\geq 4}(G) \neq \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $u \in V_{\geq 4}(G)$. Then it is easy to see that every vertex of $G' = G - \{x, y\}$ distinct from v is of degree at least 3 in G' . By Theorem F, G' (and therefore G) contains a cycle of length 0-mod 3, and then we are done.

Case 2. $\{u, v\} \cap V_{\geq 4}(G) = \emptyset$, i.e., $u, v \in V_3(G)$.

We put again $G' = G - \{x, y\}$, and we consider the graph $G'_{u,v}$. Suppose that the vertex $\{u, v\}$ of $G'_{u,v}$ has degree at least 3 in $G'_{u,v}$. Since each of the vertices u and v has exactly 2 neighbors in $G - \{x, y, v, u\}$, and since $\{u, v\}$ has degree at least 3 in $G'_{u,v}$, it follows that u and v have at most one common neighbor in G' , and then it is easy to see that at most one vertex of $G'_{u,v}$ is of degree less than 3 in $G'_{u,v}$. By Theorem F, $G'_{u,v}$ contains a cycle C of length 0-mod 3, and then as above we get a cycle of G of length 0-mod 3. So, we may suppose that $\{u, v\}$ has degree at most 2 in $G'_{u,v}$. Then necessarily, u and v have two common neighbors w and z in G' . Observe that x, y, v and u have no neighbors in $G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$ and that $wz \notin E(G)$.

Suppose that $\{w, z\} \cap V_{\geq 4}(G) \neq \emptyset$. Consider then the graph $G'' = G - \{x, y, v\}$. Then, it is easy to see that $\sigma_2(G'') \geq 5$, and hence by the induction hypothesis, we are done. So, we may suppose $w, z \in V_3(G)$. We consider now two subcases.

Case 2.1. w has a neighbor a in $G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$ and z has a neighbor b in $G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$ distinct from a .

Suppose first that $ab \in E(G)$. We consider the graph $G_1 = G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$. It is easy to see that $\sigma_2(G_1) \geq 5$ and then by the induction hypothesis we are done. Suppose now that $ab \notin E(G)$. Then the graph $G_2 = G_1 + ab$ is of minimum degree at least 3. Then G_2 contains a cycle C_1 of length 0-mod 3. If C_1 does not contain the edge ab of G_2 , we are done. If C_1 contains ab , then by deleting this edge and by adding the vertices w, u and z , we get a cycle of G of length 0-mod 3, and so we are done.

Case 2.2. The vertices w and z have a common neighbor a in $G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$.

It is easy to see that all the vertices of $G_1 = G - \{x, y, v, u, w, z\}$ distinct from a are of degree at least 3 in G_1 , and then by Theorem F, we are done. So, the assertion is true for n , and Theorem 7 is proved. $\square$

References

- [1] C. Bazgan, Z. Tuza, D. Vanderpooten, Efficient algorithms for decomposing graphs under degree constraints, Discrete Appl. Math. 155 (2007) 979–988.
- [2] G. Chen, A. Saito, Graphs with a cycle of length divisible by three, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 60 (1994) 277–292.
- [3] K. Corrádi, A. Hajnal, On the maximal number of independent circuits in a graph, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 14 (1963) 423–443.

- [4] R. Diestel, Graph Theory, Fourth edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 173, Springer, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [5] H. Enomoto, On the existence of disjoint cycles in a graph, *Combinatorica* 18 (1998) 487–492.
- [6] A. Diwan, Decomposing graphs with girth at least five under degree constraints, *J. Graph Theory* 33 (2000) 237–239.
- [7] J.E. Dunbar, M. Frick, The Path Partition Conjecture is true for claw-free graphs, *Discrete Math.* 307 (2007) 1285–1290.
- [8] J.E. Dunbar, M. Frick, F. Bullock, Path partitions and P_n -free sets, *Discrete Math.* 289 (2004) 145–155.
- [9] R. Gould, P. Horn, C. Magnant, Multiply Chorded Cycles, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Math.* 28 (2014) 160–172.
- [10] A. Hajnal, E. Szemerédi, Proof of a conjecture of P. Erdős, *Combinatorial Theory and Its Application* 2 (1970) 601–623.
- [11] A. Kaneko, On decomposition of triangle-free graphs under degree constraints, *J. Graph Theory* 27 (1998) 7–9.
- [12] D. Kühn, D. Osthus, Partitions of graphs with high minimum degree or connectivity, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 88 (2003) 29–43.
- [13] L. Lovász, On decomposition of graphs, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* 1 (1966) 237–238.
- [14] M. Stiebitz, Decomposing graphs under degree constraints, *J. Graph Theory* 23 (1996) 321–324.
- [15] C. Thomassen, Non-separating cycles in k -connected graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 5 (1981) 351–354.
- [16] C. Thomassen, Paths, circuits and subdivisions, in (L. W. Beineke and R.J. Wilson, Eds.), *Selected topics in graph theory III*, academic Press, New York (1988) 97–131.
- [17] C. Thomassen, Configurations in graphs of large minimum degree, connectivity, or chromatic number, *Combinatorial Mathematics: Proceedings of the Third International Conference* (New York, 1985), 402–412, *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 555, New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1989.
- [18] H. Wang, On the maximum number of independent cycles in a graph, *Discrete Math.* 205 (1999) 183–190.
- [19] F. Yang, E. Vumar, A note on a cycle partition problem, *Appl. Math. Lett.* 24 (2011) 1181–1184.